

**Sample survey of the characteristics
of the ethnic minorities in Hong Kong:
main findings**

Introduction

The Home Affairs Bureau and the Census and Statistics Department commissioned a private consultant to conduct a sample survey of Hong Kong's ethnic minorities. The enquiry was carried out between October 1999 and January 2000. This was an interim measure pending the 2001 Population Census. The aim was to obtain a broad indication of their numbers, composition and demographic characteristics. The analysis of the findings of the survey is now complete. This paper summarises the key findings.

Methodology and research design

2. The survey successfully enumerated around 9,500 households, selected at random from the 'Frame of Quarters' maintained by the Census and Statistics Department. A greater sampling fraction was assigned to districts - such as Central and Western, Wanchai, Yau Tsim Mong and Yuen Long - with relatively high minority populations. This was to reduce the risk of under-sampling inherent in any attempt to enumerate very small populations through the random sampling of a total population (non-Chinese comprise just 4% of Hong Kong's population). See **Annex A**.

Caveat

3. The findings exposed some of the limitations of the random sampling technique in exercises of this nature. Even with the larger than usual sample base, the 'strike rate' (contacts with non-Chinese respondents) was always likely to be relatively low and, in the event, some anomalous results were obtained. For example, the Nepalese population was estimated at just 8,100, about half the number known from immigration statistics. Additionally, the survey discovered no persons of Indian origin born in Hong Kong, contrary to the known

reality. Thus, while the findings provide some useful insights into the socio-economic characteristics of our minority communities, they need to be treated with caution. Nevertheless, the lessons learned in the course of the exercise will be put to good use in the 2001 Population Census, which is to be conducted next March.

The findings

4. The key areas covered by the survey were -

- (1) ethnicity;
- (2) age;
- (3) sex;
- (4) educational attainment;
- (5) activity status (employment and unemployment);
- (6) monthly income;
- (7) occupation;
- (8) ability to speak and write Chinese and English; and
- (9) difficulties encountered.

5. The survey also covered marital status, country of origin, right of abode outside Hong Kong, nationality, language spoken at home, and intention to stay permanently in Hong Kong. We have omitted them from this summary because, while of general interest, they do not bear directly on the principal theme of the enquiry. Omissions that will be rectified in the Census include right of abode in Hong Kong and persons born in Hong Kong.

Ethnicity

6. The number of persons belonging to the ethnic minorities was estimated to be 279,600, or 4.1%¹ of the total population. This estimate closely matches the 4.4% predicted by language usage: see the table at paragraph 1(e) in Part I of our report. Some 48,500 of this total (over 17%) were males; 231,000 (nearly 83%) were females. In ethnic terms,

¹ The confidence interval at 5% significance level was 4.1% ± 1.0%.

Filipinos formed the largest group (nearly 57%), followed by Indonesians (over 14%). **Table 1** disaggregates these figures by ethnicity and sex. This and all other tables reproduced in this summary are at **Annex B**

Age

7. The median age was about 32, ranging between 27 and 38. But most Indians, Thais and 'Others'² (the latter being mainly managerial/professionals) were aged 35 and over. See **Table 2**.

Sex

8. Over 90% of the Filipinos, Indonesians and Thais were female, reflecting the large number of persons from the respective countries working in Hong Kong as domestic helpers (classified as an "elementary occupation" for the purposes of the survey). But at 64% and 72% respectively, males predominated in the Nepalese and Pakistani communities. See **Table 2**.

Educational attainment

9. Relatively large numbers of Indonesians (over 27%), Pakistanis (nearly 44%), and Thais (over 22%) had been educated only to the primary level or below. By contrast, relatively large numbers of 'Others' (nearly 64%), Indians (50.8%), Nepalese (over 36%) and Filipinos (nearly 32%) had received tertiary education. Over 53% of the Nepalese community had matriculated from secondary school and over 36% had received tertiary education. See **Table 3**.

Employment and unemployment

10. Most (92.5%) respondents aged 15 and over were economically active. The overall rate of unemployment was 2.2%, well below the 'global' Hong Kong rate of 6.0%³ at the time of the survey. However, the rate was higher among Indians (11.8%), Nepalese (14.3%)

² 'Others' included British, Japanese, Europeans (excluding British), American, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, Africans, Koreans, Bengalis, Sri Lankans

³ As at the fourth quarter of 1999 when the survey was conducted, the 'global' Hong Kong rate was 6.0% (the "global" Hong Kong rate was 4.8% as at the third quarter of 2000).

and Pakistanis (29.0%). It was of interest that - at 6.9% - the rate among 'Others' was higher than the Hong Kong average. The rate was zero or near zero among Filipinos, Indonesians and Thais. This was not surprising, as most have entered Hong Kong on specific contracts of employment as domestic helpers or imported labourers. See **Table 4**.

Median monthly income

11. The overall median was HK\$3,800, which closely reflects the standard rates for domestic helpers. This was to be expected, as most Indonesians, Filipinos and Thais are domestic helpers and, together, comprise over 74% of the total minority population. At first sight, the figure appears to be well below the Hong Kong median of \$10,000⁴. But it must be borne in mind that, in addition to salary, the standard contract for domestic helpers includes accommodation (a significant factor in Hong Kong where rentals are relatively high in global terms), and a food allowance. However, we note that a small percentage of Filipinos (0.2%) and Indonesians (0.8%) - and a larger percentage of Nepalese (5.3%) - were earning less than even the \$3,800 median as, indeed, were 5.7% of 'Others'. On the other hand, the overall median for Indians (\$13,000) and 'others' as a whole (\$36,000) compared favourably with the Hong Kong median. That for Nepalese (\$10,000) was the same as for the community as a whole. See **Table 5**.

Occupation

12. The managerial/professionals (including 'associate professionals') comprised persons of all ethnic groups. Predictably, however, membership of this group was most characteristic of the well-established Indian community (over 63%) and 'Others' (nearly 90%), with Indonesians (2.2%) and Filipinos (4.4%) being the least represented. Of interest was that some 26.5 % of the Thai community fell within the managerial/professional category, though nearly 59% of

⁴General Household Survey, fourth quarter 1999. The figure is the (then) median for all employed persons. The median for males was \$11,000; for females \$8,000; and for \$17,000 households. The corresponding figures for the third quarter of 2000 were \$10,000 for all employed persons; \$11,000 for males; \$8,500 for females and \$17,600 for all households.

that community were in 'elementary occupations', mostly domestic helpers. The Nepalese were fairly evenly spread through all categories (nearly 17% managerial/professionals; 39.5% in the crafts/service/sales sectors and nearly 44% in the elementary occupations). The Pakistanis were unusual with nearly 14% in the managerial/professional category, over 86% in the elementary occupations, and none in any of the other categories. This may be an anomaly of the sampling method (paragraph 2 above). See **Table 5**.

Language ability: Cantonese

13. About half of all respondents claimed to be able to speak some Cantonese, with nearly 32% claiming a fluent or conversational command of the spoken language. Thais had the best command⁵, with 95% claiming either fluency or conversational ability, the rest claiming at least a basic level. They were followed by Indonesians, of whom about 19% had no command of the language, about 48% had conversational ability and about 19% were fluent⁶. Of interest were the Indians, of whom 57% could not speak Cantonese but nearly 32% were fluent. This probably reflects differences between migrant workers and those belonging to the established, settled community. A similar, though differently balanced pattern was apparent among Pakistanis of whom over 10% were fluent and about 46% had conversational ability. But nearly 44% had no command of the language. See **Table 6**.

14. Filipinos (about 6% fluent, 17% conversational, 52.5% none) fell in the middle of the range. Over 12% of 'Others' claimed fluency and nearly 5% conversational ability. These levels were surprisingly high because, in general, non-Chinese managerial/professional 'expatriates' are relatively short-term residents who tend to learn only basic Cantonese. This suggests that some respondents in this group were ethnically of mixed ('Eurasian') origin. The Nepalese community

⁵ Linguists do not consider Thai to be a Sinitic language. But, like the Chinese languages, it is tonal and has similarities of both vocabulary and structure, particularly with Cantonese. Thus, Thais tend to acquire Cantonese quickly after their arrival in Hong Kong.

⁶ Many Indonesians are at least partially of Chinese descent and acquire at least a working knowledge of one or more dialects through contact with relatives. This is also true of some Filipinos but to a lesser extent.

claimed the least command of the language, with 79% unable to speak it at all and none claiming fluency. This was not unexpected as the Nepalese are Hong Kong's newest minority and Nepali, an Indo-European language, is wholly unrelated to Chinese. See **Table 6**.

15. As expected, few respondents claimed the ability to write (a little over 4%) or read (nearly 7%) Chinese. Indians (12.2%), 'others' (just over 8%), Pakistanis (10.6%), and Thais (10.5%) were the most accomplished writers. At the other end of the spectrum were the Nepalese (none), Indonesians (nearly 6%) and Filipinos (under 2%). The pattern was much the same for reading ability. The best readers were 'Others' (over 11%), Indians (nearly 15%), Pakistanis (nearly 16%), and Thais (27.5%). The groups with the lowest levels of reading ability were the Nepalese (none), Filipinos (nearly 3%) and Indonesians (nearly 10%). See **Tables 7 and 8**.

Language ability: English

16. The overall ability to speak English was high at nearly 88% (over 60% fluent and nearly 26% conversational). Indians and Nepalese (both 97.5%) had the best overall command, though over 85% of Indians were fluent as opposed to 41% of Nepalese. 'Others' (96.5%) and Filipinos (96%) were next: over 80% and nearly 69% respectively being fluent. Pakistanis had the lowest overall command with nearly 62% being unable to speak the language, followed by the Thais (over 55%) and Indonesians (just over 40%). See **Table 6**.

17. These patterns were repeated in regard to writing and reading. Overall, they were about 83% and over 85% respectively. The most accomplished writers were Indians (97.5%), Filipinos (just over 93%) and Nepalese (about 94%), followed by 'Others' (over 91%). Fewer Indonesians (nearly 51%), Thais (34%) and Pakistanis (26%) could do so, though those levels are also high. Reading levels were even higher at an overall 85%. Again, the highest levels of ability were those of the Indians (97.5%), Filipinos (nearly 95%), Nepalese (about 94%), and 'Others' (over 91%). The levels among the Indonesians (over 51%), Thais (nearly 37%) and Pakistanis (26%) were also high. See **Tables 7 and 8**.

Difficulties encountered

18. Fewer than 21% of all respondents had encountered difficulties during their time in Hong Kong. Pakistanis (nearly 45%), 'Others' (nearly 39%), and Thais (nearly 23%) had encountered the most difficulties, Indians and Nepalese both under (12%) the least. Filipinos (nearly 17%) and Indonesians (nearly 18%) fell in the middle of the range. See **Table 9**. Language problems were by far the most common source of such difficulties, being cited by nearly 69% of all those who had encountered difficulties of any kind. 'Other difficulties' were a distant second at 12% followed by job problems (under 8%) and housing problems: (6.5%). See **Table 10**.

19. Of those who had encountered difficulties, most (nearly 84%) had sought help from friends, employers, colleagues or relatives. Only 10% had sought assistance from voluntary organisations or social workers and fewer than 7% from Government departments. See **Table 11**.

**Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region,
People's Republic of China
December 2000**

Research Design

Survey coverage

The survey covered the land-based non-institutional population of Hong Kong. The following categories of people were excluded:

- Hotel transients and inmates of institutions; and
 - Persons living on board vessels.
-

Sampling frame and sample selection

The survey adopted the frame of quarters maintained by the Census and Statistics Department as the sampling frame. The frame consists of two parts:

- Register of Quarters (RQ); and
- Register of Segments (RS).

The RQ contains computerised records of all addresses of permanent quarters in built-up areas; while the RS contains records of all segments in non-built-up areas which are delineated by relatively permanent and identifiable landmarks such as footpaths and rivers.

The survey was based on a sample of quarters scientifically selected from records of all permanent and temporary structures in Hong Kong. The sampling units were permanent quarters in the RQ and segments in the RS, with each segment containing about ten quarters on average. The use of segments as the sampling unit in non-built-up areas is necessary since the quarters in these areas may not have clear addresses and cannot readily be identified individually.

Owing to the small number of persons belonging to the ethnic minorities, a disproportionate sampling design was adopted for the survey whereby districts believed to have a higher proportion of residents belonging to the ethnic minorities were allocated a greater sampling fraction. These districts included Central & Western, Wan Chai, Eastern, Kowloon City, Yau Tsim Mong and Yuen Long.

Based on the information collected from the interviewed households and applying appropriate weighting factors to take account of their different probabilities of selection in the disproportionate sampling design, the situation of the entire population of Hong Kong could be inferred.

Reliability of the estimates

The findings of the enquiry were subject to sampling and non-sampling errors. As the estimates related to ethnic minorities were only based on a small number of sample observations, the sampling error may be relatively large.

For comparing the precision of the estimates of the variables measured in this report, the coefficient of variation (CV) was used. CV was obtained by expressing the standard error (SE) as a percentage of the estimate to which it referred. In turn, the SE was computed according to the formula which were established on the basis of statistical theory. Generally speaking, the SE was related to the variability of the elements in the population, the size of the sample and the sample design adopted for the survey.

The CV of the estimates of the main variables are given below:

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Sample estimate</i>	<i>CV</i>
Number of persons in Hong Kong belonging to the ethnic minorities	279 600	13.8%
Percentage of persons belonging to the ethnic minorities among all persons in Hong Kong	4.1%	12.4%

Contacting and interviewing persons belonging to the ethnic minority groups proved difficult and this might have caused them to be under-represented in the survey. The survey estimates of the actual sizes of the various minority groups should be treated with caution. Nevertheless, reference may be made to the survey findings for gaining some insights into the socio-economic characteristics of the persons of different ethnic minority groups.

Number of successful interviews

A total of 9 546 households within a scientifically selected sample were enumerated and the response rate was 72%.

Questionnaire design

The questionnaire for this survey consisted of two parts:

- 1) A core part designed to collect detailed information on basic personal characteristics;
- 2) A supplementary part containing specially designed questions to collect data on the characteristics of the ethnic minorities.

More specifically, the data items of relevancy to this survey about the ethnic minorities were -

- Age
 - Sex
 - Activity status
 - Educational attainment
 - Marital status
 - Country of origin
 - Nationality
 - Right of abode outside Hong Kong
 - Language spoken
 - Literacy in Chinese and English
 - Intention to stay permanently in Hong Kong
 - Special needs and the difficulties they are facing, if any
-

Rounding of figures

Owing to rounding, there may be slight discrepancies between the sum of individual items and the total as shown in the tables.

Table 1 **Distribution by ethnic group and sex**

<i>Ethnic Group</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000)/Percentage</i>		
	<i>Sex</i>		<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	
Filipino	5.5	152.7	158.1
	11.3%	66.1%	56.6%
Indonesian	2.0	38.2	40.1
	4.0%	16.5%	14.4%
Indian	5.1	7.0	12.1
	10.6%	3.0%	4.3%
Thai	0.8	9.3	10.1
	1.6%	4.0%	3.6%
Nepalese	5.2	3.0	8.1
	10.7%	1.3%	2.9%
Pakistani	3.9	1.5	5.5
	8.1%	0.7%	2.0%
Others [^]	26.1	19.3	45.4
	53.6%	8.4%	16.2%
<i>Overall</i>	<i>48.5</i>	<i>231.0</i>	<i>279.6</i>
	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

[^] *Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan*

Annex B

Table 2 Distribution by demographic profiles and ethnic group

Demographics	No. of Persons ('000) /Percentage							Overall
	Ethnic Group							
	Filipinos	Indonesians	Indians	Nepalese	Thais	Pakistanis	Others [^]	
Sex								
➤ Male	5.5	2.0	5.1	5.2	0.8	3.9	26.1	48.5
	3.5%	4.9%	42.2%	63.7%	7.8%	71.9%	57.4%	17.4%
➤ Female	152.7	38.2	7.0	3.0	9.3	1.5	19.3	231.0
	96.5%	95.1%	57.8%	36.3%	92.2%	28.1%	42.6%	82.6%
Age								
➤ 0-4	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	2.1	2.7
				6.7%			4.7%	1.0%
➤ 5-14	0.8	0.5	0.6	-	-	-	3.4	5.3
	0.5%	1.3%	4.6%				7.5%	1.9%
➤ 15-24	15.4	14.6	1.7	1.9	-	2.2	2.2	38.1
	9.8%	36.5%	14.1%	23.1%		41.0%	4.8%	13.6%
➤ 25-34	81.8	20.1	2.0	4.6	3.6	1.1	11.0	124.3
	51.7%	50.1%	16.6%	56.6%	35.9%	20.7%	24.3%	44.5%
➤ 35-44	50.9	4.3	4.1	0.8	5.2	-	14.9	80.2
	32.2%	10.6%	34.0%	10.0%	51.0%		32.9%	28.7%
➤ 45-54	6.4	0.6	1.4	-	1.1	1.5	7.3	18.2
	4.0%	1.5%	11.2%		10.7%	27.5%	16.1%	6.5%
➤ 55-64	1.6	-	2.3	0.3	0.2	0.6	3.4	8.4
	1.0%		19.3%	3.5%	2.4%	10.8%	7.4%	3.0%
➤ 65 or above	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	2.3
	0.8%						2.3%	0.8%
Median age	32	27	38	28	36	28	37	32
Marital Status								
➤ Never married	85.7	16.2	2.9	2.4	1.1	2.0	13.5	123.8
	54.2%	40.3%	24.2%	29.8%	11.0%	36.0%	29.7%	44.3%
➤ Married	69.3	23.7	9.2	5.7	8.7	3.2	30.2	150.0
	43.8%	59.0%	75.8%	70.2%	86.4%	58.4%	66.5%	53.7%
➤ Separated/ Divorced	1.1	-	-	-	0.3	-	1.5	2.9
	0.7%				2.6%		3.3%	1.0%
➤ Widowed	2.0	0.3	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	2.9
	1.3%	0.6%				5.5%	0.6%	1.0%
Overall	158.1	40.1	12.1	8.1	10.1	5.5	45.4	279.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Table 3 Distribution by educational attainment and ethnic group

<i>Educational attainment</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000)/Percentage</i>							<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Ethnic Group</i>							
	<i>Filipinos</i>	<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>Indians</i>	<i>Nepalese</i>	<i>Thais</i>	<i>Pakistanis</i>	<i>Others[^]</i>	
➤ No schooling/ kindergarten	1.3 0.8%	-	-	0.8 10.2%	0.2 2.4%	-	3.7 8.1%	6.1 2.2%
➤ Primary	9.8 6.2%	10.9 27.1%	2.2 17.7%	-	2.0 20.0%	2.4 43.6%	1.0 2.3%	28.3 10.1%
➤ Secondary/matriculated	96.5 61.0%	27.5 68.5%	3.8 31.4%	4.3 53.3%	6.5 64.4%	2.8 51.4%	11.8 26.0%	153.3 54.8%
<i>Lower secondary</i>	36.0 22.8%	14.8 37.0%	1.8 15.1%	-	1.7 17.2%	1.4 25.3%	3.2 7.0%	58.9 21.1%
<i>Upper secondary</i>	60.5 38.3%	12.7 31.6%	2.0 16.3%	4.3 53.3%	4.8 47.3%	1.4 26.2%	8.6 19.0%	94.4 33.8%
➤ Tertiary	50.5 31.9%	1.7 4.3%	6.2 50.8%	3.0 36.4%	1.3 13.1%	0.3 4.9%	28.9 63.6%	91.8 32.8%
<i>Overall</i>	158.1 100.0%	40.1 100.0%	12.1 100.0%	8.1 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	45.4 100.0%	279.6 100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Annex B

Table 4 Persons belonging to ethnic minorities aged 15 and over by activity status and ethnic group

Activity status	No. of Persons ('000) / Percentage							Overall
	Ethnic Group							
	Filipinas	Indonesians	Indians	Nepalese	Thais	Pakistanis	Others ^	
> Economically active	153.5	38.8	8.6	6.3	9.1	3.1	31.7	251.1
Employed	153.0 (99.7%)	38.8 (100.0%)	7.5 (88.2%)	5.4 (85.7%)	9.1 (100.0%)	2.2 (71.0%)	29.3 (93.1%)	245.6 (97.8%)
Unemployed	0.5 (0.3%)	-	1.0 (11.8%)	0.9 (14.3%)	-	0.9 (29.0%)	2.2 (6.9%)	5.5 (2.2%)
> Economically inactive	3.8	0.8	3.0	1.3	1.0	2.4	8.2	20.5
Students	0.3	0.3	1.5	-	-	1.1	1.6	4.8
Homemakers	0.2%	0.7%	12.6%	-	-	20.6%	4.1%	1.8%
Retired persons	3.3	0.5	1.5	0.9	1.0	1.3	5.8	14.3
Others	2.1%	1.3%	13.3%	12.5%	9.8%	23.2%	14.5%	5.3%
Retired persons	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	1.0
Others	0.2%	-	-	0.4 5.0%	-	-	1.9%	0.4 0.1%
Overall	157.4 100.0%	39.6 100.0%	11.6 100.0%	7.6 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	39.9 100.0%	271.6 100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Figures in brackets represent the percentages of all economically active persons in the respective ethnic groups.

Annex B

Table 5 Employed persons by socio-economic profiles and ethnic group

Socio-economic profiles	No. of Persons ('000) /Percentage							Overall
	Ethnic Group							
	Filipinos	Indonesians	Indians	Nepalese	Thais	Pakistanis	Others ^	
Occupation								
➤ Managers and administrators	0.5 0.4%	0.6 1.5%	2.9 38.6%	0.6 12.0%	0.8 8.8%	0.3 13.7%	11.7 39.5%	17.4 7.1%
➤ Professionals	0.8 0.5%	-	1.1 14.0%	0.3 4.8%	0.3 2.8%	-	12.7 43.1%	15.1 6.1%
➤ Associate professionals	5.4 3.5%	0.3 0.7%	0.8 10.6%	-	1.4 14.9%	-	2.2 7.3%	10.0 4.1%
➤ Clerks	0.3 0.2%	-	2.1 27.8%	0.3 4.8%	0.3 3.1%	-	0.8 2.8%	3.8 1.5%
➤ Service workers and shop sales workers	1.6 1.0%	0.4 1.0%	-	0.9 17.1%	0.3 3.0%	-	1.6 5.4%	4.7 1.9%
➤ Craft and related workers	-	-	-	1.0 17.6%	0.9 9.4%	-	-	1.8 0.7%
➤ Elementary occupations	144.4 94.4%	37.6 96.8%	0.7 9.0%	2.4 43.8%	5.3 58.0%	1.9 86.3%	0.3 1.0%	192.5 78.4%
➤ Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3 0.9%	0.3 0.1%
Monthly personal income								
➤ Less than \$2,000	0.3 0.2%	0.3 0.8%	-	0.3 5.3%	-	-	1.7 5.7%	2.5 1.0%
➤ HK\$2,000 – \$5,999	143.2 93.6%	37.0 95.5%	1.8 24.3%	0.3 5.3%	5.2 56.7%	0.8 36.1%	1.4 4.6%	189.6 77.2%
➤ HK\$6,000 – \$9,999	3.6 2.4%	0.7 1.7%	0.7 8.8%	0.6 11.8%	2.4 25.8%	1.1 50.2%	0.5 1.8%	9.6 3.9%
➤ HK\$10,000 – \$14,999	1.1 0.7%	-	1.0 13.2%	2.7 50.3%	0.3 3.0%	0.3 13.7%	1.6 5.3%	6.9 2.8%
➤ HK\$15,000 – \$19,999	1.4 0.9%	-	1.1 14.7%	0.6 10.6%	0.3 3.1%	-	2.9 9.9%	6.3 2.6%
➤ HK\$20,000 – \$29,999	1.8 1.2%	-	0.8 10.9%	0.3 4.8%	0.5 5.7%	-	2.6 8.9%	6.1 2.5%
➤ HK\$30,000 or more	0.8 0.5%	0.6 1.4%	1.4 17.9%	0.6 12.0%	0.3 2.8%	-	17.7 60.1%	21.4 8.7%
➤ Refused	0.8 0.5%	0.2 0.6%	0.8 10.3%	-	0.3 3.0%	-	1.1 3.6%	3.2 1.3%
Median (HK\$)	3,800	3,700	13,000	10,000	4,000	7,000	36,000	3,800
Overall	153.0 100.0%	38.8 100.0%	7.5 100.0%	5.4 100.0%	9.1 100.0%	2.2 100.0%	29.5 100.0%	245.6 100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Annex B

Table 6 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities by whether could speak Cantonese / English, fluency in Cantonese / English and ethnic group

<i>Whether could speak Cantonese/English / fluency in Cantonese/ English</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000) /Percentage</i>							<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Ethnic Group</i>							
	<i>Filipinos</i>	<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>Indians</i>	<i>Nepalese</i>	<i>Thais</i>	<i>Pakistanis</i>	<i>Others</i>	
Could speak Cantonese	75.1	32.4	5.2	1.7	10.1	3.1	12.0	139.5
	47.5%	80.8%	43.0%	21.0%	100.0%	56.4%	26.4%	49.9%
Fluency in Cantonese								
Fluent	9.1	7.7	3.8	-	4.6	0.6	5.6	31.3
	5.8%	19.1%	31.6%	-	45.1%	10.3%	12.4%	11.2%
Conversational	27.1	19.4	0.6	0.4	5.0	2.5	2.1	57.0
	17.1%	48.4%	4.6%	4.8%	49.7%	46.1%	4.6%	20.4%
Simple words only	38.9	5.3	0.8	1.3	0.5	-	4.3	51.1
	24.6%	13.3%	6.8%	16.2%	5.2%	-	9.5%	18.3%
Could not speak Cantonese	83.0	7.7	6.9	6.4	-	2.4	33.4	140.1
	52.5%	19.2%	57.0%	79.0%	-	43.6%	73.6%	50.1%
Overall	158.1	40.1	12.1	8.1	10.1	5.5	45.4	279.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Could speak English	151.7	24.0	11.8	7.9	4.5	2.1	43.8	245.8
	96.0%	59.9%	97.5%	97.5%	44.6%	38.2%	96.5%	87.9%
Fluency in English								
Fluent	108.7	6.5	10.4	3.3	2.7	0.8	36.4	168.8
	68.7%	16.4%	85.4%	40.9%	26.6%	15.1%	80.2%	60.4%
Conversational	43.1	14.6	1.5	4.6	1.3	1.2	5.8	72.1
	27.3%	36.5%	12.1%	56.6%	12.8%	23.1%	12.7%	25.8%
Simple words only	-	2.8	-	-	0.5	-	1.6	5.0
	-	7.0%	-	-	5.2%	-	3.6%	1.8%
Could not speak English	6.4	16.1	0.3	0.2	5.6	3.4	1.6	33.8
	4.0%	40.1%	2.5%	2.5%	55.4%	61.8%	3.5%	12.1%
Overall	158.1	40.1	12.1	8.1	10.1	5.5	45.4	279.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Annex B

Table 7 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities by whether could speak Cantonese or Putonghua / English, ability to write Chinese / English and ethnic group

<i>Whether could speak Cantonese or Putonghua/ English / ability to write Chinese/English</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000) /Percentage</i>							<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Ethnic Group</i>							
	<i>Filipinos</i>	<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>Indians</i>	<i>Nepalese</i>	<i>Thais</i>	<i>Pakistanis</i>	<i>Others ^</i>	
<i>Could speak Cantonese or Putonghua</i>	75.7 47.9%	33.0 82.3%	5.8 47.9%	1.7 21.0%	10.1 100.0%	3.1 56.4%	15.8 34.8%	145.1 51.9%
<i>Ability to write Chinese</i>								
Yes	2.7 1.7%	2.2 5.6%	1.5 12.2%	- -	1.1 10.5%	0.6 10.6%	3.7 8.1%	11.7 4.2%
No	72.9 46.2%	30.7 76.7%	4.3 35.7%	1.7 21.0%	9.1 89.5%	2.5 45.8%	12.2 26.7%	133.3 47.7%
<i>Could not speak Cantonese or Putonghua</i>	82.4 52.1%	7.1 17.7%	6.3 52.1%	6.4 79.0%	- -	2.4 43.6%	29.6 65.2%	134.5 48.1%
<i>Overall</i>	158.1 100.0%	40.1 100.0%	12.1 100.0%	8.1 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	45.4 100.0%	279.6 100.0%
<i>Could speak English</i>	151.7 96.0%	24.0 59.9%	11.8 97.5%	7.9 97.5%	4.5 44.6%	2.1 38.2%	43.8 96.5%	245.8 87.9%
<i>Ability to write English</i>								
Yes	147.2 93.1%	20.3 50.7%	11.8 97.5%	7.6 94.3%	3.5 34.3%	1.4 26.4%	41.4 91.2%	233.3 83.4%
No	4.5 2.9%	3.7 9.2%	- -	0.3 3.2%	1.0 10.3%	0.6 11.8%	2.4 5.3%	12.5 4.5%
<i>Could not speak English</i>	6.4 4.0%	16.1 40.1%	0.3 2.5%	0.2 2.5%	5.6 55.4%	3.4 61.8%	1.6 3.5%	33.8 12.1%
<i>Overall</i>	158.1 100.0%	40.1 100.0%	12.1 100.0%	8.1 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	45.4 100.0%	279.6 100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Annex B

Table 8 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities by whether could speak Cantonese or Putonghua / English, ability to read Chinese / English and ethnic group

<i>Whether could speak Cantonese or Putonghua/ English / ability to read Chinese/English</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000) /Percentage</i>							<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Ethnic Group</i>							
	<i>Filipinos</i>	<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>Indians</i>	<i>Nepalese</i>	<i>Thais</i>	<i>Pakistanis</i>	<i>Others ^</i>	
<i>Could speak Cantonese or Putonghua</i>	75.7 47.9%	33.0 82.3%	5.8 47.9%	1.7 21.0%	10.1 100.0%	3.1 56.4%	15.8 34.8%	145.1 51.9%
<i>Ability to read Chinese</i>								
Yes	4.6 2.9%	3.9 9.7%	1.8 14.6%	-	2.8 27.5%	0.9 15.8%	5.2 11.4%	19.2 6.9%
No	71.0 45.0%	29.1 72.6%	4.0 33.3%	1.7 21.0%	7.3 72.5%	2.2 40.6%	10.6 23.4%	125.9 45.0%
<i>Could not speak Cantonese or Putonghua</i>	82.4 52.1%	7.1 17.7%	6.3 52.1%	6.4 79.0%	-	2.4 43.6%	29.6 65.2%	134.5 48.1%
<i>Overall</i>	158.1 100.0%	40.1 100.0%	12.1 100.0%	8.1 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	45.4 100.0%	279.6 100.0%
<i>Could speak English</i>	151.7 96.0%	24.0 59.9%	11.8 97.5%	7.9 97.5%	4.5 44.6%	2.1 38.2%	43.8 96.5%	245.8 87.9%
<i>Ability to read English</i>								
Yes	149.7 94.8%	20.6 51.4%	11.8 97.5%	7.6 94.3%	3.8 36.9%	1.4 26.4%	41.4 91.2%	236.3 84.5%
No	2.0 1.2%	3.4 8.5%	-	0.3 3.2%	0.8 7.7%	0.6 11.8%	2.4 5.3%	9.5 3.4%
<i>Could not speak English</i>	6.4 4.0%	16.1 40.1%	0.3 2.5%	0.2 2.5%	5.6 55.4%	3.4 61.8%	1.6 3.5%	33.8 12.1%
<i>Overall</i>	158.1 100.0%	40.1 100.0%	12.1 100.0%	8.1 100.0%	10.1 100.0%	5.5 100.0%	45.4 100.0%	279.6 100.0%

- "Zero" in value

^ Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan

Table 9 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities aged 15 and above by incidence of encountering difficulties in Hong Kong and ethnic group

<i>Incidence of encountering difficulties in Hong Kong</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000)/Percentage</i>							
	<i>Ethnic Group</i>							<i>Overall</i>
	<i>Filipinos</i>	<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>Indians</i>	<i>Nepalese</i>	<i>Thais</i>	<i>Pakistanis</i>	<i>Others[^]</i>	
Yes	26.6	7.1	1.3	0.9	2.3	2.5	15.4	56.0
	16.9%	17.9%	11.2%	11.4%	22.8%	44.8%	38.6%	20.6%
No	130.8	32.5	10.3	6.7	7.8	3.0	24.5	215.6
	83.1%	82.1%	88.8%	88.6%	77.2%	55.2%	61.4%	79.4%
<i>Overall</i>	<i>157.4</i>	<i>39.6</i>	<i>11.6</i>	<i>7.6</i>	<i>10.1</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>39.9</i>	<i>271.6</i>
	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

[^] *Others included British, Japanese, European (excluding British), American, Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, African, Korean, Bengali, Sri Lankan*

Table 10 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities aged 15 and above who had encountered difficulties in Hong Kong by type of difficulties encountered

<i>Type of difficulties encountered[@]</i>	<i>No. of Persons ('000)</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Language problem	38.5	68.8%
Job/career	4.3	7.6%
Housing	3.6	6.5%
Transport	2.4	4.3%
Entertainment	2.3	4.1%
Medical	1.1	1.9%
Communication	1.1	1.9%
Education	0.5	1.0%
Others	6.7	12.0%
<i>Total numbers of persons</i>	<i>56.0</i>	

[@] *Multiple answers were allowed*

Table 11 Persons belonging to the ethnic minorities aged 15 and above who had sought assistance when encountering difficulties in Hong Kong by sources of assistance

<i>Sources of assistance</i> [@]	<i>No. of Persons ('000)</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Friends	6.1	37.9%
Employers	3.6	22.5%
Relatives	2.3	14.0%
Colleagues	1.5	9.5%
Voluntary organisations	1.4	8.4%
Government departments	1.1	6.8%
Neighbours	0.5	3.2%
Social workers	0.3	1.6%
Others	3.5	21.5%
Total numbers of persons	16.2	

[@] Multiple answers were allowed